

Serial No. 09/741,537

PU000176

REMARKS

In view of the following discussion, the applicants submit that none of the claims now pending in the application are obvious under the provisions of 35 U. S. C. § 103. Thus, the applicants believe that all of these claims are in allowable form.

REJECTIONS

A. Double Patenting

1. Claims 1 and 4-7

Claims 1 and 4-7 are provisionally rejected under 35 U. S. C. § 101 as being unpatentable over claims 1-5 of co-pending application serial no. 09/745,748.

In applicants' previous response filed April 4, 2003, application serial no. 09/745,748 was distinguished over claims 1 and 4-7. The applicants reiterate those comments and respectfully request that this rejection of claims 1 and 4-7 be withdrawn.

2. Claim 1

Claim 1 is provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of co-pending application serial no. 09/741,541.

In response, the applicants file the accompanying terminal disclaimer to obviate this rejection.

As such, the applicants respectfully request that this rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn.

Serial No. 09/741,537

PU000176

3. Claim 1

Claim 1 is provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of co-pending application serial no. 09/800,234.

In response, the applicants file the accompanying terminal disclaimer to obviate this rejection.

As such, the applicants respectfully request that this rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn.

4. Claims 1 and 3-4

Claims 1 and 3-4 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 3 and 7-8 of co-pending application serial no. 09/746,242.

In response, the applicants file the accompanying terminal disclaimer to obviate this rejection.

As such, the applicants respectfully request that this rejection of claims 1 and 3-4 be withdrawn.

B. 35 U. S. C. § 103

1. Claims 1 and 3-7 are not obvious over Nosker et al. in view of Cherukuri et al.

Claims 1 and 3-7 stand rejected under 35 U. S. C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Nosker et al. (U. S. Patent 5,646,478 issued July 8, 1997) in view of Cherukuri et al. The applicants submit that these claims are not rendered obvious by the combination of these references.

Serial No. 09/741,537

PU000176

Claim 1 is directed to a cathode-ray tube 10 comprising a focus mask 25 and a screen 22 (see, FIG. 1 and the specification at page 3, line 30 to page 4, line 32). The focus mask 25 includes a plurality of electrodes 40, 60 separated from one another by an insulator 62 (see, FIGS. 4-6 and the specification at page 6, lines 26-32). The insulator 62 is formed of a low porosity lead-zinc-borosilicate glass powder having a median particle size less than about 1 μm (see, specification at page 7, line 21 to page 8, line 7).

Nosker et al. describes a cathode-ray tube 10 comprising a focus mask 25 and a screen 22 (see, Nosker et al. at FIG. 1 and column 3, lines 2-6). The focus mask 25 includes a plurality of first metal strands 40 (see, Nosker et al. at FIG. 4 and column 3, lines 31-33). A plurality of second metal strands 60 are disposed perpendicular to the first metal strands 40 and are spaced therefrom by an insulator 62 (see, Nosker et al. at FIG. 4 and column 3, lines 63-66). The insulator is formed of a devitrifying glass that electrically isolates the second metal strands 60 from the first metal strands 40 (see, Nosker et al. at FIGS. 4-5 and column 4, lines 20-31). The devitrifying glass is a lead-zinc-borosilicate glass, SCC-11 (see, Nosker et al. at column 5, lines 8-13).

Nosker et al. does not describe or suggest a focus mask including a plurality of electrodes separated from one another by an insulator formed of a lead-zinc-borosilicate glass powder having a median particle size less than about 1 μm . Rather, Nosker et al. only teaches a focus mask including a plurality of second metal strands disposed perpendicular to a plurality of first metal strands and isolated therefrom by a lead-zinc-borosilicate devitrifying glass. Since Nosker et al. does not use a lead-zinc-borosilicate glass powder having a median particle size less than about 1 μm , claim 1 is patentable over Nosker et al.

Claims 3-7 depend directly, or indirectly, from claim 1. In view of such dependence on claim 1, the applicants submit that claims 3-7 are also patentable over Nosker et al.

Cherukuri et al. describes a cathode-ray tube 10 comprising a focus mask 25 and a screen 22 (see, Cherukuri et al. at FIG. 1 and column 3, lines 8-20).

Serial No. 09/741,537

PU000176

The focus mask 25 includes a plurality of first metal strands 40 (see, Cherukuri et al. at FIG. 4 and column 3, lines 56-58). A plurality of second metal strands 60 are disposed perpendicular to the first metal strands 40 and are spaced therefrom by an insulator 62 (see, Cherukuri et al. at FIG. 4 and column 4, lines 20-25). The insulator is formed of a devitrifying glass having an average particle size less than 10 μm (see, Cherukuri et al. at Table IV).

Cherukuri et al. does not describe or suggest a focus mask including a plurality of electrodes separated from one another by an insulator formed of a lead-zinc-borosilicate glass powder having a median particle size less than about 1 μm . Rather, Cherukuri et al. only teaches a focus mask including a plurality of second metal strands disposed perpendicular to a plurality of first metal strands and isolated therefrom by a lead-zinc-borosilicate devitrifying glass having an average particle size less than 10 μm . Since Cherukuri et al. does not use a lead-zinc-borosilicate glass powder having a median particle size less than about 1 μm , claim 1 is patentable over Cherukuri et al.

Claims 3-7 depend directly, or indirectly, from claim 1. In view of such dependence on claim 1, the applicants submit that claims 3-7 are also patentable over Cherukuri et al.

Furthermore, since Nosker et al. only teaches a focus mask including a plurality of second metal strands disposed perpendicular to a plurality of first metal strands and isolated therefrom by a lead-zinc-borosilicate devitrifying glass and Cherukuri et al. only teaches a focus mask including a plurality of second metal strands disposed perpendicular to a plurality of first metal strands and isolated therefrom by a lead-zinc-borosilicate devitrifying glass having an average particle size less than 10 μm , the combination of these references does not describe or suggest applicants invention recited in claim 1. In particular, claim 1 recites a focus mask including a plurality of electrodes separated from one another by an insulator formed of a lead-zinc-borosilicate glass powder having a median particle size less than about 1 μm . Thus, claim 1 is patentable over Nosker et al. in view of Cherukuri et al.

Serial No. 09/741,537

PU000176

Claims 3-7 depend directly, or indirectly, from claim-1. In view of such dependence on claim 1, the applicants submit that claims 3-7 are also patentable over Nosker et al. in view of Cherukuri et al.

CONCLUSION

Thus, the applicants submit that none of the claims, presently in the application, are obvious under the provisions of 35 U. S. C. § 103. Consequently, the applicants believe that all of the claims are presently in condition for allowance. Accordingly, both reconsideration of this application and its swift passage to issue are earnestly solicited.

If, however, the Examiner believes that there are any unresolved issues requiring a continuation of the adverse final action in any of the claims now pending in the application, it is requested that the Examiner telephone Ms. Patricia A. Verlangieri, at (609) 734-6867, so that appropriate arrangements can be made for resolving such issues as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully submitted,



Patricia A. Verlangieri, Attorney
Reg. No. 42,201
(609) 734-6867

Patent Operation
Thomson Licensing Inc.
P. O. Box 5312
Princeton, NJ 08543-5312

December 22, 2003